



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,063	11/24/2003	Srinivasan N. Rao	14846-32	3266
<div>7590 GEORGE MORGAN LOWENSTEIN SANDLER, PC 65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE ROSELAND, NJ 07068</div>				
<div>12/19/2008</div>				
<div>EXAMINER BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J</div>				
<div>ART UNIT 2434</div>		<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>		
<div>MAIL DATE 12/19/2008</div>		<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/721,063

**Applicant(s)**

RAO ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN

**Art Unit**

2434

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The Request for Continued Examination has been accepted and entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Bass teaches that login information must be provided in two separate instances. The examiner asserts that this portion of Bass is not relied upon, and the actual authentication relied upon is found in Blakely. However, even if this was relied upon, the applicant has not claimed such a limitation.

Additionally Bass is no longer relied upon. Blakely encompasses all of the limitations taught by Bass.

Applicant submits that Cox fails to teach an interface component configured to compare an identifier associated with the authentication component with an expected identifier. The applicant asserts that Cox does not meet the limitations as claimed. The examiner asserts that the IP address of the Authentication component (Intermediate Server of "Blakeley") is an identifier of the Authentication component. The communications from the Authentication component (Intermediate Server) use the IP protocol, and thus have an IP address associated with the component. Cox teaches matching expected IP address with a stored IP address and if

they match, allowing the communication. If the IP addresses do not match, the communication is cancelled. Thus the claim limitation is met.

Applicant argues that Cox does not compare an expected identifier associated with the authentication component. Applicant states that in Cox packets are filtered according to rules associated with a user. The Examiner argues that Cox is not relied on for the "Authentication component" and merely to match an identifier with an expected identifier and if the identifiers match, the data is allowed to pass. This system meets the current claim limitations. A Resource or "Request processor" may filter packets by IP address according to rules associate with the Resource, where the Resource expects that the IP address be a specific address. In combination with Blakely, this address is the IP address of the "Intermediate Server" or Authentication component.

Applicant argues that Cox teaches away from the combination because the security of packet filtering would be unnecessary. To teach away, Cox must state explicitly that it cannot be used, when authentication is used. Additionally, because a user is authenticated does not prevent further communications security breaches. Since the communication takes place over a network, it may be intercepted at any point. IP packet filtering assures the resource that the packets are not from an undesirable source.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-5, 8-12, and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakeley III US 7,039,714 in view of Cox US 2004/0039940.**

As per claim 1, 8, and 15, Blakely III teaches a single sign-on authentication system, comprising: an authentication component that determines whether a user is authenticated, (primary logon) (Col 5 lines 25-35). Blakely III teaches if it is determined that the user is authenticated, the authentication component (Intermediate Server) generates a connection request (request a first resource) (Col 5 lines 11-18).

Blakely III does not teach an interface component that compares a received identifier with an expected identifier.

Cox teaches communication including an identifier (IP source address) where the interface component compares the received identifier with an expected identifier and if they match makes information available to the server (compares the IP source against expected source address and drops or passes the packets according to a defined set of rules) [0034], [0035], [0039], [0041].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the packet filtering of Cox with Blakeley III in order to prevent malicious packets from entering the system.

As per claims 2, and 9 Blakeley teaches the entitlement information is different from the information used to authenticate the user (primary logon, intermediate logon) (Col 5 lines 25-35).

As per claims 3, and 10 Cox teaches that the identifier an IP address is used as an identifier [0007].

As per claims 4 and 11 Blakely teaches teaches using a user id and or password to determine entitlement information (primary user id determines secondary used id) (Col 5 lines 25-35).

As per claims 5, and 12 Blakeley teaches the information used to authenticate the user includes one or more of a user identifier and a password (primary username/password) (Col 4 lines 10-15) (Col 5 lines 25-30).

**Claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakeley III US 7,039,714 in view of Cox US 2004/0039940 in view of Amon US 2004/0111463**

As per claims 6 and 13, Amon teaches the entitlement information is contained in a header portion of a data packet (URL in the HTTP header) Claim 11.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the URL in the http header in the combination because it is a well known and widely used internet protocol.

As per claims 7 and 14, Amon teaches the connection request is sent as an HTTP request (HTTP Post request) Claim 11.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher J Brown/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2434

12/14/08